

# STATES OF JERSEY



## WAR AGAINST IRAQ

---

**Presented to the States by Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier  
and lodged au Greffe on 4th February 2003  
by Senator F.H. Walker**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

## **PROPOSITION**

**THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –**

to agree that it is the view of the Assembly that no military action should be taken by the governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom against Iraq without a fresh United Nations mandate, following clear evidence of the need for war; and to request the Bailiff to transmit the view of the Assembly to Her Majesty's Government with a request that the opinion of the States be also forwarded to the government of the United States of America by Her Majesty's Government.

DEPUTY G.P. SOUTHERN OF ST. HELIER

## REPORT

The President of the Policy and Resources Committee has pledged that, should they contact him, he will transmit the views of the people of Jersey to the British government. He also says "There is no realistic chance of the views making a scrap of difference."

I believe that to put such responsibility onto the people of Jersey to express their opinion is to negate the proper role of the States. In bringing this proposition, I am giving Members the opportunity to express their opinion on behalf of the people of Jersey. The President of the Policy and Resources Committee may well be correct, but I prefer to share Joy Nursey's view that "it is worth the effort".

I believe also that we have a very short time in which to express our view to the respective governments. Already a quarter of the British Army is on its way to the Gulf; military action may not be too far away, but we are not there yet. Hence, I bring this proposition on a "blue".

Dr. Hans Blix has reported back on behalf of the Nuclear Weapons Inspectorate to the United Nations. He has made it clear that his conclusions are of an interim nature and that the case has not been made for military action. More time is required, and despite the spin put on the report by U.S. and U.K. spokespersons, France, Germany, China and Russia have all expressed their reservations about pre-emptive action.

We all accept that the world would be safer without Saddam Hussein's baleful dictatorship. But I see no contradiction between distaste for his regime and the profound doubts many have about the way in which the U.S., with Tony Blair's support, proposes to launch an invasion. The situation is developing rapidly into a test of confidence in the U.K. government. There is genuine public perception that we are being bulldozed into a war not of our choosing, and not, on the evidence presented so far, vital to our interests.

I believe it is vitally important that we, the representatives of the people of Jersey, point out our objections to unilateral action by U.K. troops. War, declared under such circumstances, would not only inflict great misery on the people of Iraq, already suffering the effects of economic sanctions. The Society of Friends is correct when they say that such a war "would extend violence across the region, encourage extremists and intensify religious and ethnic hatred". I believe we must do what little we can to try to prevent such an outcome.

There are no financial or manpower implications arising out of this proposition.